

# FISCAL NOTE

**Bill #:** HB0649

**Title:** Emergency stream flow for fisheries

**Primary Sponsor:** Clark, P

**Status:** As Introduced

Sponsor signature	Date	Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	---------------------------------	------

## Fiscal Summary

	<b><u>FY 2004</u></b> <b><u>Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2005</u></b> <b><u>Difference</u></b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>		
General Fund	\$0	\$0
<b>Revenue:</b>		
General Fund	\$0	\$0
<b>Net Impact on General Fund Balance:</b>	\$0	\$0

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov. Impact    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached  | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2  |

## Fiscal Analysis

### ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The referenced federal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program (WCRP) is no longer in existence. FWP assumes the federal program State Wildlife Grants (SWG) would replace the WCRP.
2. "Uncommitted" will refer to dollars for which no project specific grant agreement has been approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to "obligate" the funds.
3. In FFY 2001 FWP received an apportionment of \$852,710 for WCRP of which \$896 is currently uncommitted.
4. In FFY 2002 the FWP received a SWG apportionment of \$1,367,32, of which \$722,495 is currently not obligated. However, FWP has established priorities and identified potential projects for these funds.
5. Congress must approve SWG funding on a year-to-year basis. There is no assurance that additional apportionments will be received.
6. Certain water leasing and other water augmentation measures for emergency instream flow would be eligible projects for SWG funding and otherwise comply with requirements. Use of SWG funds must be approved by the USFWS and SWG funds are available on a reimbursement basis only.
7. The SWG program requires a minimum 50 percent match for implementation. So \$500,000 of state funds would be necessary to match \$500,000 of federal funds.

## **Fiscal Note Request HB0649, As Introduced**

(continued)

8. This bill would require the FWP, starting in current FY 2003, to reprioritize projects funded with either federal SWG funds and state funds for future fisheries improvement projects, bull trout and cutthroat trout enhancement projects and river restoration projects.
9. There would be a loss of federal SWG funds to the FWP if funds reserved for water leasing projects were not approved by the USFWS prior to deadlines for obligating funding.

### TECHNICAL NOTES:

1. As mentioned in Assumption # 1, the federal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program was funded for only one year (FFY 2001) and is no longer in existence. It has been replaced by State Wildlife Grants that must be approved by Congress on a year-to-year basis.
2. Section 1(2) states that funding “must come from any uncommitted funds allocated to the state under the federal wildlife conservation and restoration program.” Since this apportionment comes to the state on a year-to-year basis, it is all uncommitted initially. It is not clear if the bill refers to ‘uncommitted funds’ as of a certain date.
3. It is not clear if this is to be an on-going or a one-time requirement.
4. Since the bill is effective on passage and approval, it would require adjustments in the current FY 2003 budget.